Awareness and Acceptability of the University’s Philosophy, Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives: Stakeholders’ Evaluation

.

ABSTRACT

|  |
| --- |
| **Aims:** This study aimed to assess the level of awareness and acceptance of the Philosophy, Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives (PVMGO) among school stakeholders.  **Study design:** The research employed a descriptive survey method to gather data on stakeholder perceptions of the school’s PVMGO.  **Place and Duration of Study:** The study was conducted at the University of La Salette, Incorporated-High School, between May to June 2025.  **Methodology:** A total of 504 respondents (48 administrators, faculty, staff; 236 students; and 220 parents/ guardians and alumni) participated in the study through a convenience sampling. A self-constructed questionnaire that directly measures the PVMGO of the school.  **Results:** The results showed that all stakeholder groups demonstrated high levels of awareness and acceptance across all areas of the PVMGO. Among administrators, faculty, and staff, the highest mean scores were observed in Philosophy (M=3.92), Vision (M=3.91), and Mission (M=3.90), with General Acceptability rated at M=3.84. Students also reflected consistently high results, with mean ranging from M=3.66 to M=3.72, while parents and alumni scored slightly lower but still within the high range, with means from M=3.52 to M=3.62.  **Conclusion:** With these findings, it is evident that the PVMGO remains relevant and timely in today’s educational landscape and have continuously guiding the institution’s direction and development. Further, it implies that the institution has effectively communicated its PVMGO across stakeholders. However, despite the high ratings, the findings served as a guide in developing policies that further strengthens the application of PVMGO into academic instruction, co-curricular programs, employee training and development, and community engagement. |

*Keywords: awareness, acceptability, philosophy, vision, mission, goals, objectives, stakeholder*

1. INTRODUCTION

In schools, having a clear purpose and shared direction is very important. These are shown in the Philosophy, Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives (PVMGO) of the institution. The PVMGO is not just a set of statements; it guides decisions, shapes programs, and influences the day-to-day transactions in school (Clemente & Clemente, 2022). Further, these ideals show what the school values, what it hopes to achieve in the future, and what it considers most important in education.

To ensure holistic institutional development, all aspects, including faculty growth, student formation, and school culture, must align with the PVMGO. It directs the behavior and decisions of all members of the academic community and serves as a foundation for the school’s identity and integrity. In an era where schools are increasingly held accountable for inclusivity, relevance, and performance, the regular review and effective internalization of the PVMGO are important (Lague et al., 2021).

The Philippine education system supports this alignment through national policies and quality assurance standards. For example, the Department of Education (DepEd), through the School-Based Management (SBM) framework, requires schools to create their vision and mission statements in line with national goals and the needs of their local communities (DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2015). In the same way, the Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges, and Universities (PAASCU, 2021) also expects schools to have a clear PVMGO that is well-communicated and consistently followed in everyday school activities. The Private Education Assistance Committee (PEAC) also considers the PVMGO as integral to quality assurance, especially in evaluating schools participating in programs such as the Education Service Contracting (ESC) and the Senior High School Voucher Program (SHS-VP). The monitoring tool of PEAC reviews how well the PVMGO is understood and applied in teaching, student support, and the overall culture of the school (PEAC, 2019). These tools highlight that a school’s success is not only measured by its facilities or student performance, but also by how much the people in the school, faculty members, non-teaching personnel, and students, know, accept, and live out its PVMGO.

Despite its importance, a recurring challenge in many institutions is the gap between the written PVMGO and its lived experience. Inspirational mission statements remain ineffective if not clearly communicated, meaningfully understood, and internalized by all stakeholders—students, faculty, staff, alumni, parents, and community members. This disconnect can result in weak stakeholder engagement, inconsistent practices, and diminished institutional coherence (Kaur & Lodhia, 2019).

Rooted in Marian devotion, ULSHS traces its origins to the arrival of the Missionaries of Our Lady of La Salette in Santiago, Isabela, in 1948. The school was formally established in 1950 and has since grown into a Catholic institution that integrates faith, service, and personal transformation into its educational approach (University of La Salette, n.d.).

The PVMGO of ULSHS highlights the values of reconciliation, holistic development, and service. It aims to produce graduates who are "responsible life-long learners, have a passion for excellence, are service-oriented, live a God-centered life, and are in communion with others in building a better world" (ULSHS Student Handbook, 2025). This is achieved not only through academic instruction but also through activities that build character, promote community involvement, and strengthen spiritual growth. Every day practices at the school are designed to reflect and promote the school's core values.

The school’s continued success in academics, extra-curricular activities, sports, and research shows its strong commitment to excellence. ULSHS also takes part in community development programs and trains its staff to be speakers and advocates for important social and moral issues. These actions demonstrate how the school implements its PVMGO in meaningful and concrete ways.

Literature underscores the significance of stakeholder awareness and alignment with institutional goals. Studies consistently report that school stakeholders have very high to high levels of PVMGO awareness and acceptance (Alvarado et al., 2022; Bentor et al., 2017; Cunanan & Heretape, 2023; Dela Cruz et al., 2024; Guiquing, 2021; Laurente, 2019; Rañeses, 2018; Segismundo, 2017; Simbulan & Taja-on, 2021; Tubang-Delgado & Martinez-Farren, 2022; Villanca et al., 2021), which can lead to their improved institutional identity, culture, engagement, and performance. Although high awareness and acceptance are frequently reported in all stakeholders, challenges persist in ensuring sustained engagement and understanding across all groups (Sebastian & Villa, 2022). For instance, Billones et al. (2024), Dela Cruz et al. (2022), and Talosa et al. (2021) recommend the role of communication strategies, such as posters, social media, bulletin boards, manuals, and brochures, in increasing awareness of the school’s PVMGO. In another study by Dela Cruz et al. (2024), they recommended to include ongoing stakeholder engagement, awareness campaigns, feedback mechanisms, professional development, and enhanced student support services to continuously increase acceptability of the school’s goals and program objectives.

In addition, studies by Salom and Florendo (2013) and Gurley et al. (2015) show that schools with clear and consistently followed guiding statements are more effective in reaching their goals and improving overall performance. Further, scholars such as Gomez and Basco (2022) and Arado et al. (2019) found that stakeholder alignment with the PVMGO strengthens coherence and institutional support.

Some other studies found that internal stakeholders (faculty, staff, administrators, students) tend to exhibit higher levels of awareness and alignment compared to external stakeholders (alumni, and parents) (Dagdag, 2024; Dalisay et al., 2019; Fernandez, 2015; Garcia, Rogayan, & Gagasa, 2021; Llobrera-Diamse, G., Visayas, A., & Dela Cruz, M., 2022; Pelicano, A. & Lacaba, L., 2016).

Furthermore, existing studies point to challenges in how the PVMGO is shared and understood. Rabacal and Agawa (2023) found that many schools depend on passive ways of communication, which limits how far the message spreads. Estrada (2018) observed that involving external stakeholders remains difficult, while Dela Cruz et al. (2022) noted that parents and alumni are often not familiar with their school’s guiding statements.

Despite the body of literature affirming the importance of PVMGO alignment, the PAASCU recommends that schools should consider a periodic review of the school’s vision and mission, including the Philosophy, goals, and objectives. Further, many schools still struggle to ensure that all members of the community fully understand and accept these statements. Besides, the majority of the previous studies were conducted in higher education and post-graduate degrees.

This study is anchored on Freeman’s Stakeholder Theory (1984), which states that organizations should pay attention to the needs and concerns of everyone who is connected to them, not just the leaders or administrators. In a school setting, stakeholders include students, teachers, staff, parents, alumni, and even members of the partner institutions. This study is valuable to the institution as it serves as a guide in improving academic provisions, decision-making processes, student activities, community involvement, and strengthening engagement with all stakeholders.

Given this context, this study sought to assess the level of awareness and acceptability of the PVMGO among the stakeholders of ULSHS. Specifically, it answered the following questions:

1. What is the level of awareness of the University of La Salette’s Philosophy, Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives according to the following sectors:

a. Administrators, Faculty and Staff

b. Students

c. Alumni and parents


2. What is the level of acceptability of the University of La Salette’s Philosophy, Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives according to the following sectors:

a. Administrators, Faculty and Staff

b. Students

c. Alumni and parents

**Research Paradigm**

****

*Figure 1. Research paradigm of the Study*

Figure 1 shows the research paradigm used in this study. It focuses on three groups of stakeholders: the administration, faculty and staff; students; and parents and alumni. The study looks at how aware and how accepting these groups are of the school’s Philosophy, Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives (PVMGO). The arrows in the diagram show that the perception of each group are important in reviewing and evaluating how well the school’s guiding principles are known and accepted. This helps the school see if its goals are clear and meaningful to everyone in the community.

2. material and methods

**Research Design**

The researchers employed a quantitative approach, specifically a descriptive survey research design, to assess the level of awareness and acceptability of the PVMGO among the stakeholders. A survey research design is used to collect structured data from individuals or groups to measure their perceptions, behaviors, or experiences regarding a particular topic (McCombes, 2025). In this study, the design was appropriate as it provided a general snapshot of stakeholder trends, allowing the researchers to gather and analyze data from a large population efficiently. Thus, the approach enabled the quantification of stakeholder awareness and acceptability of the school's PVMGO, making it suitable for the objectives of the study.

**Locale and Respondents of the Study**

This study was conducted at the University of La Salette, Incorporated–High School (ULSHS), located in Santiago City, Isabela, Philippines. The respondents included a total of 504 stakeholders from various sectors of the school community. Respondents were selected through convenience sampling, as survey forms were distributed to individuals who were readily available in the school premises, during parents’ meetings, and in school offices. Table 1 shows the distribution of respondents across the different stakeholder sectors.

**Table 1. Distribution of School Stakeholders**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **n** | **%** |
| Administration, Faculty and Staff | 48 | 9.52 |
| Students | 236 | 46.83 |
| Parents and alumni | 220 | 43.65 |
| **Total** | **504** | **100.00** |

**Instrument**

The research instrument used in this study was a self-constructed survey questionnaire. It utilized a four-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 ("Not at all aware/Not acceptable at all") to 4 ("Highly aware/Highly acceptable"), to measure stakeholders' levels of awareness and acceptability of the school’s PVMGO. Part I of the questionnaire focused on awareness, with each component of the PVMGO assessed separately to allow for more specific analysis. Part II evaluated the level of acceptability, covering four key areas: general acceptability and relevance, clarity and understanding, practical application and implementation, and personal commitment and support. The instrument underwent content validation by three (3) field experts in education and institutional quality assurance to ensure relevance and alignment with the school’s PVMGO.

**Data Gathering Procedure**

Prior to data collection, formal approval was obtained from the school administration. The researcher personally distributed printed copies of the survey instrument, together with the informed consent to guarantee voluntary involvement and to address any ethical considerations. The schedule for administering the survey was coordinated based on the availability of the respondents, and the data gathering was conducted within the institutional premises. Respondents were provided with a brief explanation regarding the objectives of the study and the general content of the questionnaire to ensure informed participation. Upon completion, the responses were collected and systematically encoded in Microsoft Excel for subsequent analysis.

**Data Analysis**

In this study, data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, specifically by computing the mean scores and standard deviation. The weighted mean was utilized to assess the overall level of awareness and acceptability of the school's PVMGO as perceived by the respondents. The given scale was used to analyze and interpret the result of the data gathered:

***Table 2. Arbitrary Scale***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Scale** | **Descriptive Interpretation (DI)** |
| 3.26-4.00 | Highly aware/ acceptable |
| 2.51-3.25 | Aware / Acceptable |
| 1.76-2.50 | Slightly aware/ Acceptable |
| 1.00-1.75 | Not at all aware/ acceptable |

3. results

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.** **Respondents’ Level of Awareness on School’s Philosophy** | | | | | | | | | |
| Domains | **Administration, Faculty & Staff** | | | **Students** | | | **Parents & Alumni** | | |
| WM | SD | DI | WM | SD | DI | WM | SD | DI |
| Philo 1 | 3.85 | 0.36 | HA | 3.70 | 0.53 | HA | 3.48 | 0.74 | HA |
| Philo 2 | 3.94 | 0.24 | HA | 3.66 | 0.55 | HA | 3.50 | 0.72 | HA |
| Philo 3 | 3.94 | 0.24 | HA | 3.65 | 0.57 | HA | 3.41 | 0.74 | HA |
| Philo 4 | 3.94 | 0.24 | HA | 3.69 | 0.58 | HA | 3.58 | 0.71 | HA |
| Philo 5 | 3.96 | 0.20 | HA | 3.66 | 0.58 | HA | 3.60 | 0.70 | HA |
| Philo 6 | 3.92 | 0.28 | HA | 3.69 | 0.58 | HA | 3.56 | 0.70 | HA |
| Philo 7 | 3.94 | 0.24 | HA | 3.65 | 0.57 | HA | 3.54 | 0.71 | HA |
| Philo 8 | 3.90 | 0.31 | HA | 3.67 | 0.59 | HA | 3.52 | 0.73 | HA |
| Philo 9 | 3.92 | 0.28 | HA | 3.65 | 0.57 | HA | 3.54 | 0.69 | HA |
| Philo 10 | 3.88 | 0.33 | HA | 3.68 | 0.56 | HA | 3.53 | 0.69 | HA |
| **Overall Mean** | **3.92** | **0.28** | **HA** | **3.67** | **0.56** | **HA** | **3.53** | **0.71** | **HA** |

*\*Interpretation: 3.26-4.00: Highly aware (HA) ; 2.51-3.25: Aware (A); 1.76-2.50: Slightly aware (SA); 1.00-1.75: Not at all aware (NA)*

Table 3 presents the level of awareness of various school stakeholders, namely Administration, Faculty & Staff; Students; and Parents & Alumni, across ten philosophical education domains. Overall, all three groups are classified as "Highly aware," with the Administration, Faculty & Staff having the highest overall weighted mean (M= 3.92; SD= 0.28), followed by Students (M= 3.67; SD= 0.56), and Parents & Alumni (M= 3.53; SD= 0.71). This indicates that those who work within the institution have a stronger and more consistent understanding of the school’s philosophy compared to students and external stakeholders like parents and alumni.

Among the ten domains, the Administration, Faculty & Staff, and the parents and alumni showed the highest awareness in *“I understand that the Philosophy of Education emphasizes holistic growth in freedom and fullness of being”* (M = 3.96; SD= 0.20, M= 3.60; SD= 0.70). This implies that these group of stakeholders have deeply internalized the school’s philosophical foundation through various initiatives and decisions that promote holistic development. On the other hand, students scored highest rating in *“I am familiar with the school’s Philosophy of Education and its significance”* (M= 3.70; SD= 0.53), which indicates that students have the basic awareness on the school’s Philosophy.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4. Respondents’ Level of Awareness on School’s Vision** | | | | | | | | | |
| Domains | **Administration, Faculty & Staff** | | | **Students** | | | **Parents & Alumni** | | |
| WM | SD | DI | WM | SD | DI | WM | SD | DI |
| Vision 1 | 3.94 | 0.20 | HA | 3.68 | 0.58 | HA | 3.49 | 0.72 | HA |
| Vision 2 | 3.96 | 0.24 | HA | 3.66 | 0.56 | HA | 3.55 | 0.69 | HA |
| Vision 3 | 3.88 | 0.33 | HA | 3.67 | 0.55 | HA | 3.53 | 0.70 | HA |
| Vision 4 | 3.88 | 0.33 | HA | 3.66 | 0.57 | HA | 3.52 | 0.69 | HA |
| Vision 5 | 3.85 | 0.36 | HA | 3.67 | 0.59 | HA | 3.56 | 0.67 | HA |
| Vision 6 | 3.92 | 0.28 | HA | 3.66 | 0.55 | HA | 3.59 | 0.71 | HA |
| Vision 7 | 3.85 | 0.41 | HA | 3.63 | 0.64 | HA | 3.55 | 0.68 | HA |
| Vision 8 | 3.94 | 0.24 | HA | 3.69 | 0.54 | HA | 3.55 | 0.67 | HA |
| Vision 9 | 3.94 | 0.24 | HA | 3.68 | 0.56 | HA | 3.62 | 0.66 | HA |
| Vision 10 | 3.94 | 0.24 | HA | 3.70 | 0.55 | HA | 3.64 | 0.62 | HA |
| **Overall Mean** | **3.91** | **0.30** | **HA** | **3.67** | **0.57** | **HA** | **3.56** | **0.68** | **HA** |

*\*Interpretation: 3.26-4.00: Highly aware (HA) ; 2.51-3.25: Aware (A); 1.76-2.50: Slightly aware (SA); 1.00-1.75: Not at all aware (NA)*

Table 4 shows the level of awareness on the school’s vision across three key stakeholders: Administration, Faculty & Staff, Students, and Parents & Alumni. Among the three, the Administration, Faculty & Staff group registered the highest overall weighted mean of 3.91 (SD= 0.30), indicating they are highly aware of the school’s vision. This is followed by the students (M= 3.67; SD= 0.57), and lastly the parents & alumni (M= 3.56; SD= 0.68), both also interpreted as highly aware.

In relation to the school’s Vision statement, the Administration, Faculty & Staff had the highest overall mean in *“I am aware that the school’s Vision emphasizes a community living in freedom and fullness of being”* (M = 3.96; SD= 0.24). This demonstrates a strong alignment between the institutional leadership and the school’s aspirational goals, which may ensure that administrative decisions remain consistent with the vision’s ideals.

Meanwhile, students and parents & alumni showed greater awareness of the Vision statement that emphasizes creating a reconciled, peaceful, and compassionate society (M = 3.70; SD= 0.55, M= 3.64; SD= 0.62). This indicates that these groups resonate more with the communal and relational aspects of the Vision.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 5. Respondents’ Level of Awareness on School’s Mission** | | | | | | | | | |
| Domains | **FAS** | | | **Students** | | | **Parents & Alumni** | | |
| WM | SD | DI | WM | SD | DI | WM | SD | DI |
| Mission 1 | 3.93 | 0.24 | HA | 3.66 | 0.55 | HA | 3.52 | 0.71 | HA |
| Mission 2 | 3.90 | 0.31 | HA | 3.67 | 0.56 | HA | 3.54 | 0.70 | HA |
| Mission 3 | 3.90 | 0.31 | HA | 3.67 | 0.58 | HA | 3.52 | 0.72 | HA |
| Mission 4 | 3.88 | 0.33 | HA | 3.65 | 0.58 | HA | 3.44 | 0.70 | HA |
| Mission 5 | 3.85 | 0.41 | HA | 3.64 | 0.59 | HA | 3.51 | 0.65 | HA |
| Mission 6 | 3.90 | 0.31 | HA | 3.67 | 0.60 | HA | 3.50 | 0.66 | HA |
| Mission 7 | 3.83 | 0.43 | HA | 3.67 | 0.60 | HA | 3.52 | 0.67 | HA |
| Mission 8 | 3.94 | 0.24 | HA | 3.62 | 0.61 | HA | 3.52 | 0.69 | HA |
| Mission 9 | 3.95 | 0.24 | HA | 3.68 | 0.62 | HA | 3.56 | 0.66 | HA |
| Mission 10 | 3.92 | 0.28 | HA | 3.65 | 0.59 | HA | 3.55 | 0.67 | HA |
| **Overall Mean** | **3.90** | **0.32** | **HA** | **3.66** | **0.59** | **HA** | **3.52** | **0.68** | **HA** |

*\*Interpretation: 3.26-4.00: Highly aware (HA) ; 2.51-3.25: Aware (A); 1.76-2.50: Slightly aware (SA); 1.00-1.75: Not at all aware (NA)*

As gleaned from Table 5, all respondent groups reported being “Highly aware” of the school’s mission. The Administration, Faculty & Staff group recorded the highest overall weighted mean of 3.90 (SD= 0.32), followed by the students at 3.66 (SD= 0.59), and the parents & alumni at 3.52 (SD= 068).

All stakeholder groups consistently showed the highest ratings in the statement, “*I understand that the Mission prioritizes nurturing faith and a Christ-centered way of life”* (M = 3.95; SD= 0.24, M= 3.68; SD= 0.62, M= 3.56; SD= 0.66). This suggests a strong and shared commitment among the school stakeholders in prioritizing spiritual formation and promoting the importance of school’s faith-based mission as a core element of the school’s identity and educational approach in providing Catholic education.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 6a. Respondents’ Level of Awareness on School’s Religious Goals** | | | | | | | | | |
| Domains | **FAS** | | | **Students** | | | **Parents & Alumni** | | |
| WM | SD | DI | WM | SD | DI | WM | SD | DI |
| RG 1 | 3.85 | 0.41 | HA | 3.75 | 0.52 | HA | 3.64 | 0.67 | HA |
| RG 2 | 3.85 | 0.41 | HA | 3.71 | 0.56 | HA | 3.58 | 0.67 | HA |
| RG 3 | 3.90 | 0.31 | HA | 3.73 | 0.55 | HA | 3.60 | 0.69 | HA |
| RG 4 | 3.92 | 0.28 | HA | 3.72 | 0.54 | HA | 3.62 | 0.67 | HA |
| RG 5 | 3.85 | 0.41 | HA | 3.68 | 0.55 | HA | 3.60 | 0.67 | HA |
| **Overall Mean** | **3.87** | **0.37** | **HA** | **3.72** | **0.54** | **HA** | **3.61** | **0.68** | **HA** |

*\*Interpretation: 3.26-4.00: Highly aware (HA) ; 2.51-3.25: Aware (A); 1.76-2.50: Slightly aware (SA); 1.00-1.75: Not at all aware (NA)*

Table 6a shows the level of awareness of the school’s religious goals among Administration/Faculty & Staff, Students, and Parents & Alumni. All three groups were found to be highly aware, with the Administration/Faculty & Staff having the highest overall mean (3.87; SD= 0.37), followed by Students (3.72; SD= 0.54) and Parents & Alumni (3.61; SD= 0.68).

Among the specific goals, the Administration, Faculty & Staff gave the highest rating to the statement, “*I understand that the goal of religious education is to help students fully commit to their faith*” (M = 3.92; SD= 0.28). In contrast, both students (M = 3.75; SD= 0.52) and parents and alumni (M = 3.64; SD= 0.67) rated highest in the goal, *“I understand that the school integrates Gospel teachings into daily learning and activities.”* This suggests that while the administration and faculty emphasize the commitment aspect of religious education, students and parents perceive the integration of faith in everyday school life as more prominent.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 6b. Respondents’ Level of Awareness on School’s Intellectual Goals** | | | | | | | | | |
| Domains | **FAS** | | | **Students** | | | **Parents & Alumni** | | |
| WM | SD | DI | WM | SD | DI | WM | SD | DI |
| IG 1 | 3.85 | 0.41 | HA | 3.68 | 0.59 | HA | 3.60 | 0.66 | HA |
| IG 2 | 3.90 | 0.31 | HA | 3.67 | 0.55 | HA | 3.60 | 0.62 | HA |
| IG 3 | 3.90 | 0.31 | HA | 3.64 | 0.57 | HA | 3.60 | 0.63 | HA |
| IG 4 | 3.92 | 0.28 | HA | 3.69 | 0.55 | HA | 3.63 | 0.65 | HA |
| IG 5 | 3.85 | 0.41 | HA | 3.67 | 0.60 | HA | 3.62 | 0.63 | HA |
| **Overall Mean** | **3.88** | **0.35** | **HA** | **3.67** | **0.57** | **HA** | **3.61** | **0.64** | **HA** |

*\*Interpretation: 3.26-4.00: Highly aware (HA) ; 2.51-3.25: Aware (A); 1.76-2.50: Slightly aware (SA); 1.00-1.75: Not at all aware (NA)*

Table 6b illustrates the level of awareness of the school’s intellectual goals among school stakeholders. All stakeholder groups were found to be highly aware, with the Administration/Faculty & Staff showing the highest overall weighted mean (3.88; SD= 0.35), followed by Students (3.67; SD= 0.57) and Parents & Alumni (3.61; SD= 0.64).

Among the intellectual goals, the statement “*I understand that education is a tool for personal and social development”* received the highest rating from all school stakeholders (M= 3.92; SD= 0.28, M= 3.69; SD= 0.55, M= 3.63; SD= 0.65) This consistent recognition across groups implies a collective agreement on the importance of education beyond academic learning, and its role in shaping both individual capabilities and social responsibility.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 6c. Respondents’ Level of Awareness on School’s Social Goals** | | | | | | | | | |
| Domains | **Administration, Faculty & Staff** | | | **Students** | | | **Parents & Alumni** | | |
| WM | SD | DI | WM | SD | DI | WM | SD | DI |
| SG 1 | 3.90 | 0.31 | HA | 3.71 | 0.54 | HA | 3.59 | 0.65 | HA |
| SG 2 | 3.93 | 0.25 | HA | 3.64 | 0.60 | HA | 3.57 | 0.67 | HA |
| SG 3 | 3.81 | 0.39 | HA | 3.69 | 0.58 | HA | 3.58 | 0.67 | HA |
| SG 4 | 3.92 | 0.28 | HA | 3.69 | 0.57 | HA | 3.59 | 0.65 | HA |
| SG 5 | 3.88 | 0.33 | HA | 3.68 | 0.57 | HA | 3.60 | 0.63 | HA |
| **Overall Mean** | **3.88** | **0.32** | **HA** | **3.68** | **0.57** | **HA** | **3.59** | **0.65** | **HA** |

*\*Interpretation: 3.26-4.00: Highly aware (HA) ; 2.51-3.25: Aware (A); 1.76-2.50: Slightly aware (SA); 1.00-1.75: Not at all aware (NA)*

Table 6c explains that all stakeholder groups are highly aware of the school’s social goals. The internal stakeholders recorded the highest overall awareness at 3.88; SD= 0.32, followed by Students at 3.68; SD= 0.57, and Parents & Alumni at 3.59; SD= 0.65.

For the internal stakeholders, the statement *“I recognize that students are encouraged to engage in activities that promote community service and social responsibility”* received the highest recognition among the social goals (M= 3.93; SD= 0.25). Among students, the highest rating was given to *“I understand that the school fosters social values rooted in Christian teachings”* (M= 3.71; SD= 0.54), while parents and alumni showed the greatest awareness of *“I recognize that the school encourages collaboration among students, faculty, and parents to build a strong learning community”* (M= 3.60; SD= 0.63). These results indicate that while each stakeholder group highlights different aspects of the school’s social goals, there is a shared appreciation for the school’s commitment to promoting community involvement, values formation, and collaboration.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 6d. Respondents’ Level of Awareness on School’s Physical & Psychological Goals** | | | | | | | | | |
| Domains | **Administration, Faculty & Staff** | | | **Students** | | | **Parents & Alumni** | | |
| WM | SD | DI | WM | SD | DI | WM | SD | DI |
| PPG 1 | 3.79 | 0.46 | HA | 3.72 | 0.55 | HA | 3.60 | 0.64 | HA |
| PPG 2 | 3.90 | 0.31 | HA | 3.68 | 0.57 | HA | 3.58 | 0.65 | HA |
| PPG 3 | 3.88 | 0.33 | HA | 3.66 | 0.59 | HA | 3.57 | 0.65 | HA |
| PPG 4 | 3.92 | 0.28 | HA | 3.67 | 0.55 | HA | 3.57 | 0.64 | HA |
| PPG 5 | 3.85 | 0.36 | HA | 3.71 | 0.55 | HA | 3.58 | 0.65 | HA |
| **Overall Mean** | **3.87** | **0.35** | **HA** | **3.69** | **0.56** | **HA** | **3.58** | **0.64** | **HA** |

*\*Interpretation: 3.26-4.00: Highly aware (HA) ; 2.51-3.25: Aware (A); 1.76-2.50: Slightly aware (SA); 1.00-1.75: Not at all aware (NA)*

Table 6d reveals the awareness levels of the school’s physical and psychological objectives among school stakeholders. All groups exhibited a high degree of awareness, with the Administration/Faculty & Staff scoring the highest overall weighted mean (M= 3.87; SD= 0.35), followed by Students (M= 3.69; SD= 0.56), and Parents & Alumni (M= 3.58; SD= 0.64).

Within the internal school stakeholders, the highest-rated domain was *“I understand that personal growth includes both physical and psychological well-being”* (M= 3.92; SD= 0.28), while students, as well as parents and alumni, gave their highest ratings to *“I understand that the school promotes healthy living habits for physical and moral well-being”* (M= 3.72; SD= 0.55, M= 3.60; SD= 0.64). This shows that the internal school stakeholders see personal growth as more holistic, covering both the mind and body, while external groups tend to notice the school’s efforts more in terms of promoting healthy habits and values.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 7. Respondents’ Level of Awareness on School’s Objectives** | | | | | | | | | |
| Domains | **Administration, Faculty & Staff** | | | **Students** | | | **Parents & Alumni** | | |
| WM | SD | DI | WM | SD | DI | WM | SD | DI |
| OBJ 1 | 3.90 | 0.31 | HA | 3.72 | 0.53 | HA | 3.62 | 0.66 | HA |
| OBJ 2 | 3.85 | 0.36 | HA | 3.69 | 0.55 | HA | 3.63 | 0.65 | HA |
| OBJ 3 | 3.85 | 0.36 | HA | 3.69 | 0.55 | HA | 3.59 | 0.66 | HA |
| OBJ 4 | 3.89 | 0.31 | HA | 3.70 | 0.56 | HA | 3.60 | 0.65 | HA |
| OBJ 5 | 3.83 | 0.38 | HA | 3.69 | 0.58 | HA | 3.66 | 0.64 | HA |
| **Overall Mean** | **3.87** | **0.34** | **HA** | **3.70** | **0.55** | **HA** | **3.62** | **0.65** | **HA** |

*\*Interpretation: 3.26-4.00: Highly aware (HA) ; 2.51-3.25: Aware (A); 1.76-2.50: Slightly aware (SA); 1.00-1.75: Not at all aware (NA)*

Table 7 highlights the level of awareness regarding the school’s institutional objectives among school stakeholders. All three stakeholder groups reported a consistently high level of awareness across all five objective domains, with Administration, Faculty & Staff group recorded an overall mean of 3.87 (SD= 0.34), followed by Students at 3.70 (SD= 0.55), and Parents & Alumni at 3.62 (SD= 0.65). Overall, these results point to effective dissemination of the school’s objectives and a shared understanding among both internal and external members of the academic community.

Among the domains, the Administration, Faculty & Staff, and Students gave the highest ratings to *“I understand that the school encourages students to develop a deep knowledge of the Catholic Christian faith through prayer and active participation in religious activities,”* with a mean rating of 3.90 (SD= 0.31) and 3.72 (SD= 0.53), respectively. Meanwhile, Parents & Alumni gave their highest rating to *“I recognize that the school provides a strong academic foundation to prepare students for higher education”* (M= 3.66; SD= 0.64). This shows that while those within the school community are more aware of and connected to the school’s religious and spiritual formation efforts, Parents and Alumni tend to focus more on trusting the school that its academic strengths are one way to help their children in preparation to higher form of learning and education.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 8. Respondents’ Level of Acceptability of School’s PVMGO** | | | | | | | | | |
| Domains | **FAS** | | | **Students** | | | **Parents & Alumni** | | |
| WM | SD | DI | WM | SD | DI | WM | SD | DI |
| ACC 1 | 3.89 | 0.28 | HA | 3.69 | 0.55 | HA | 3.57 | 0.62 | HA |
| ACC 2 | 3.85 | 0.41 | HA | 3.65 | 0.57 | HA | 3.53 | 0.64 | HA |
| ACC 3 | 3.88 | 0.33 | HA | 3.68 | 0.54 | HA | 3.58 | 0.65 | HA |
| ACC 4 | 3.91 | 0.28 | HA | 3.70 | 0.54 | HA | 3.58 | 0.63 | HA |
| ACC 5 | 3.93 | 0.28 | HA | 3.67 | 0.56 | HA | 3.58 | 0.63 | HA |
| ACC 6 | 3.77 | 0.42 | HA | 3.66 | 0.55 | HA | 3.55 | 0.66 | HA |
| ACC 7 | 3.69 | 0.47 | HA | 3.63 | 0.57 | HA | 3.51 | 0.65 | HA |
| ACC 8 | 3.81 | 0.39 | HA | 3.67 | 0.55 | HA | 3.55 | 0.64 | HA |
| ACC 9 | 3.81 | 0.45 | HA | 3.69 | 0.54 | HA | 3.59 | 0.63 | HA |
| ACC 10 | 3.90 | 0.28 | HA | 3.67 | 0.55 | HA | 3.58 | 0.64 | HA |
| ACC 11 | 3.77 | 0.42 | HA | 3.61 | 0.57 | HA | 3.53 | 0.66 | HA |
| ACC 12 | 3.75 | 0.48 | HA | 3.59 | 0.59 | HA | 3.55 | 0.64 | HA |
| ACC 13 | 3.81 | 0.39 | HA | 3.68 | 0.57 | HA | 3.56 | 0.64 | HA |
| ACC 14 | 3.90 | 0.31 | HA | 3.60 | 0.61 | HA | 3.55 | 0.66 | HA |
| ACC 15 | 3.77 | 0.42 | HA | 3.68 | 0.53 | HA | 3.54 | 0.65 | HA |
| ACC 16 | 3.88 | 0.33 | HA | 3.67 | 0.55 | HA | 3.53 | 0.69 | HA |
| ACC 17 | 3.85 | 0.36 | HA | 3.66 | 0.57 | HA | 3.53 | 0.66 | HA |
| ACC 18 | 3.81 | 0.39 | HA | 3.63 | 0.57 | HA | 3.52 | 0.67 | HA |
| ACC 19 | 3.90 | 0.31 | HA | 3.66 | 0.56 | HA | 3.55 | 0.66 | HA |
| ACC 20 | 3.94 | 0.28 | HA | 3.60 | 0.59 | HA | 3.55 | 0.67 | HA |
| **Overall Mean** | **3.84** | **0.32** | **HA** | **3.66** | **0.56** | **HA** | **3.55** | **0.65** | **HA** |

*\*Interpretation: 3.26-4.00: Highly acceptable (HA) ; 2.51-3.25: Acceptable (A); 1.76-2.50: Slightly acceptable (SA); 1.00-1.75: Not at all acceptable (NA)*

Table 8 outlines the level of acceptability of the school’s PVMGO as perceived by the Administration, Faculty & Staff, Students, and Parents & Alumni. All three groups demonstrated a high level of acceptability across the domains. The Administration, Faculty & Staff group reported the highest overall mean at 3.84 with SD= 0.32, indicating a greater degree of alignment and acceptance of the school’s PVMGO. This was followed by Students (M= 3.66; SD= 0.56) and Parents & Alumni (M= 3.55; SD= 0.65). Overall, the consistent "Highly aware" designation across all indicators affirms a strong institutional alignment with its guiding philosophy and objectives.

The internal school stakeholders gave the highest acceptability rating to the statement, “*I take pride in being part of a school that upholds the PVMGO in daily life*” (M = 3.94; SD= 0.28). This suggests that the Administration, Faculty, and Staff strongly identify with the school’s mission and values. Their consistent efforts to align school programs and classroom activities with the PVMGO, and to promote a sense of ownership among the community, likely contribute to this high level of pride and connection.

Moreover, students showed highest rating to the statement “*I support the integration of Filipino cultural values and faith-based principles in the PVMGO*” (M= 3.70; SD= 0.54). This indicates that they are receptive to how the school’s PVMGO reflects their cultural identity and faith. Meanwhile, Parents & Alumni rated highest on “*I observe how the PVMGO applies to my role as a student, teacher, staff member, or parent*” (M= 3.59; SD= 0.63), which suggests that they appreciate seeing the PVMGO in action through roles they are familiar with.

**4. DISCUSSION**

The school's Philosophy, Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives (PVMGO) form its core foundation and shape its identity, purpose, and direction. Further, it acts as a guide for creating policies and decisions, developing the curriculum, managing the school’s overall operations, providing student activities, and involving stakeholders. When the PVMGO is clearly communicated and widely understood, it helps improve the school’s performance and encourages more substantial support and involvement from all stakeholders.

This study assessed the level of awareness and acceptability of the school's PVMGO among school key stakeholders: administrators, faculty and staff, students, parents, and alumni. Findings from the responses of 504 respondents revealed consistently high levels of awareness and acceptability across all domains of the PVMGO, with internal stakeholders (administration, faculty, and staff) demonstrating slightly higher levels compared to external stakeholders (students, parents, and alumni) (Dagdag, 2024; Dalisay et al., 2019; Fernandez, 2015; Garcia, Rogayan, & Gagasa, 2021; Llobrera-Diamse, G., Visayas, A., & Dela Cruz, M., 2022; Pelicano, A., & Lacaba, L., 2016). These results emphasize the important role of effective communication through both print and non-print materials, along with regular orientations, consistent implementation in school programs and services, and the internalization of institutional goals in strengthening the school’s identity and where its education is anchored.

The findings of the study show that the school is successfully orienting and integrating the PVMGO into its culture through regular reinforcement and active involvement of school stakeholders, supporting earlier research showing the importance of the PVMGO in shaping a school’s identity and overall performance. The high levels of awareness and acceptance among all stakeholder groups align with the findings of previous studies (Alvarado et. al., 2022; Bentor et al., 2017; Cunanan & Heretape, 2023; Dela Cruz et al., 2024; Guiquing, 2021; Laurente, 2019; Rañeses, 2018; Segismundo, 2017; Simbulan & Taja-on, 2021; Tubang-Delgado & Martinez-Farren, 2022; Villanca et al., 2021), which stress that a clear understanding of institutional goals improves unity and effectiveness within the organization.

This study also confirms the findings of Gomez and Basco (2022) and Arado et al. (2019), who noted that alignment of policies, programs, and activities to school PVMGO encourages more substantial support and commitment from stakeholders. Moreover, the consistently high awareness ratings support the study of Dela Cruz et al. (2022), which indicates that the use of other mechanisms, such as posters, brochures, and online platforms, helps increase stakeholder awareness. On the other hand, the slightly lower awareness and acceptance among parents and alumni highlight ongoing challenges, as mentioned by Fernandez (2015) and Dela Cruz et al. (2022), especially in keeping external stakeholders engaged when they are less involved in the school’s day-to-day activities.

Furthermore, the alignment observed across specific PVMGO components, such as religious, intellectual, social, and physical/psychological goals. The current findings indicate that the school ensures that its core values are embedded in daily educational practices, which reinforces the school’s goals, objectives, and institutional identity.

Therefore, the findings of this study affirm that the school's PVMGO remains relevant and timely even after the various changes happening in the educational landscape of basic education. It further confirms that clear and regular communication, and active involvement of stakeholders are important in promoting awareness and acceptance of institutional goals to continuously align the school’s programs, activities, and decisions. While internal stakeholders demonstrate a strong understanding of the PVMGO, leading to better alignment of academic programs and student activities, the study also emphasizes the need for continued efforts to engage external stakeholders effectively.

5. Conclusion

This study served as valuable insights for setting the institution’s future direction in improving the institution's strategies and how the school instills its core values among stakeholders. It further established that school stakeholders, namely administrators, faculty and staff, students, and parents and alumni, demonstrate a high level of awareness and acceptability of the school’s PVMGO. Internal stakeholders, being more directly involved in the school’s operations, consistently showed higher levels of awareness and alignment with the PVMGO compared to external stakeholders. The results affirm the effectiveness of the school’s efforts in embedding the PVMGO within its academic and co-curricular programs.

Importantly, the findings of the study reaffirms that the PVMGO remains relevant and timely, continuing to resonate with the current educational needs. It continues to serve as a guiding framework for institutional decision-making and as a source identity and shared purpose among stakeholders as it demonstrates its lasting impact on both personal and organizational development.

While all stakeholders demonstrated high levels of awareness and acceptability of the school’s PVMGO, internal stakeholders, such as administrators, faculty, staff, and students, reflected slightly higher scores compared to parents and alumni. This suggests an opportunity to further strengthen communication and involvement efforts with external stakeholders to ensure that the values and direction set by the PVMGO continue to resonate across the broader school community.

**Recommendations**

One limitation of this study lies in its reliance on self-reported data, which may be subject to response bias or social desirability effects, particularly when assessing stakeholders' perceived awareness and acceptability of institutional goals. Future research may consider adopting a mixed-method approach to gain deeper insights into stakeholder perceptions and experiences for broader comparative analysis. Additionally, since the study was conducted in a single institution, the generalizability of the findings may be limited. To address this, future researchers may conduct the same study in their respective institutions aligning their own culture and practices.

Finally, the host institution is encouraged to take actionable steps to strengthen stakeholder engagement with the PVMGO. These include: (1) regularly review and assess stakeholders’ awareness and acceptability by including partner institutions as well, (2) strengthening the practice of the PVMGO into the academic curriculum, and (3) using digital platforms and visual materials across the campus to continuously communicate the school’s PVMGO.

**Disclaimer (Artificial intelligence)**

Authors hereby declare that generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models, etc. have been used during the editing of this manuscript. Details of the AI usage are given below:

1. ChatGPT – Assessment of clarity, coherence, and substance of the content.

2. Grammarly – Checking of grammar and possible AI text and plagiarism.

**Ethical Approval:**

As per international standards or university standards written ethical approval has been collected and preserved by the author(s).

**Consent**

As per international standards or university standards, Participants’ written consent has been collected and preserved by the author(s).

References

Alvarado, A., Bearneza, F. J., Digon, K. C., Estrellas, J., Pardillo, R., & Pineda, J. (2022). Stakeholders’ Awareness and Acceptability of the Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives of Carlos Hilado Memorial State College. *Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports*, 16(10), 93-109. 10.9734/ajarr/2022/v16i10433

Arado, L. M., Mendoza, A. D., & Esmero, D. R. P. (2019). Awareness, understanding, acceptance, and congruency of the PIT vision and mission, college goal and program objectives. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies*, 2(2), 168–175.

Bentor, S. et. Al (2017) Awareness, acceptability, and relevance of the vision, mission, goals, and objectives of the programs of Naval State University Graduate School. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research*, 32(1), 181-206.

Billones, M., Alferez, J. A., & Bunao, C. (2024). Extent of dissemination, awareness, and acceptability of the revised CSU vision, mission, and graduate school objectives among students and faculty. *Global Scientific Journals,* 12(10), 1609-1616.

Clemente, B. & Clemente, R. (2022). Awareness and acceptability of the CSU philosophy, vision, mission, goals, and objectives, and the graduate school philosophy, vision, mission, goals, and objectives. *Journal of Positive Psychology,* 6(5), 5598-5617.

Cunanan, A. & Heretape, E. (2023). School of education stakeholders’ awareness, acceptance and implementation on vision, mission, goals, and objectives. *International Journal of Scientific and Management Research*, 6(8), 43-47.

Dagdag, J. D., Palapuz, N. A., Caliboso, J. C., Peru, E. I., & Mauro, R. P. (2024). Stakeholders’ awareness and acceptance of the vision, mission, goals, and outcomes statements of a teacher education college. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 13(1), 339–346.

Dalisay, F. V., Tolentino, C. G., Perez, C. C. C., & Tamayo, J. E. (2019). Awareness and acceptability of the vision, mission and institutional goals of Pangasinan State University and program objectives of bs information technology. *Asian Journal of Business and Technology Studies*, 2(1).

Dela Cruz, E. Razon, J., Dayao, J., Garcia, K. R., Manuel, M. A., Tiria, G. & Tangcuangco, A. (2022). Awareness and acceptability of the University’s vision, mission, goals, and objectives in bachelor of science in electrical engineering program. *ASEAN Journal of Science and Engineering Education,* 2(3), 253-264.

Dela Cruz, L. A. D., Celestial, R., Camarador, R., & Cruz, J. C. D. (June 2024). Acceptability of the college of human kinetics goals and enhancing student awareness of the BPED and BSESS program objectives. *Journal of Physical Education Research*, Volume 11, Issue II, 01-05.

Department of Education. (2015). *Guidelines on the Enhanced School Improvement Planning (SIP) Process and the School Report Card (SRC)* (DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2015).

Estrada, J. (2018). Awareness and acceptability of the vision, mission and institutional goals of Pangasinan State University and AB Economics program objectives. *Southeast Asian Journal of Science and Technology*, 3(1), 21-35.

Fernandez, M. W. (2015). Awareness, acceptability, relevance and congruence of the PNU-Negros Occidental vision, mission, and goals and objectives of the teacher education program. *Asia Pacific Higher Education Research Journal*, 6(1).

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston: Pitman.

Garcia, S., Rogayan, D., & Gagasa, K. L. (2021). Stakeholders’ awareness and acceptability of university’s vision and mission, and teacher education program goals and objectives in a state institution in Central Luzon, Philippines. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 2(1), 17-23.

Gomez, A. C., & Basco, M. C. M. (2022). Awareness, acceptability, and perception of stakeholders on the vision and mission of Cavite State University, Teacher Education Department goals, and education program objectives. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 3(1), 63–72.

Guiquing, F. L. (2021). Advertency and suitability of the CSU vision - mission and college of allied health sciences goals and objectives. *EBSCOhost*.

Gurley, D. K., Peters, G. B., Collins, L., & Fifolt, M. (2015). Mission, vision, values, and goals: An exploration of key organizational statements and daily practice in schools. *Journal of Educational Change*, 16(2), 217-242.

Kaur, A. & Lodhia, S. (2019). Key issues and challenges in stakeholder engagement in sustainability reporting: A study of Australian local councils. *Pacific Accounting Review*, 31(1), 2-18.

Lague, A. M., Baguia, P. E., Morilla, H. L., Clarin, A., Edullantes, J. R., & Emperado, N. (2025). The implementation and internalization of philosophy, vision, mission, goals, objectives, and core values in the basic education department. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(1), 2489–2498.

Laurente, M. L. (2019). Stakeholders’ awareness and acceptability of the Leyte Normal University’s vision, mission, goal and objectives. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research*, 7(4), 108-117.

Llobrera-Diamse, G., Visayas, A., & Dela Cruz, M. (2022). Stakeholders’ awareness and acceptability of DMMMSU’S PVMG. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Negative Results*, 13(8), 2039-2042. DOI: 10.47750/pnr.2022.13.S08.250

McCombes, S. (2025, January 14). *Survey Research | Definition, Examples & Methods*. Scribbr. https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/survey-research/

Pelicano, A. & Lacaba, L. (2016). Awareness and acceptability of the vision, mission, goals and objectives of Eastern Samar State University. *International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences,* 3(6), 432-435.

Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges and Universities (PAASCU). (2021). *Basic education: Grade school, junior high school, senior high school, and basic education survey instrument*.

Private Education Assistance Committee (PEAC). (2019). *ESC CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT USER’S GUIDE.* [*https://peac.org.ph/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/2018-CAI-Users-Guide.pdf*](https://peac.org.ph/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/2018-CAI-Users-Guide.pdf)

Rabacal, R. & Agawa, Y. (2023). Stakeholders’ level of awareness, understanding, and acceptability of CBSUA vision, mission, and program goals and objectives of the Master of Science in Disaster Risk Management. *East Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(3), 1343–1354.

Rañeses, M.D. (2018). Bicol University college of nursing vision, mission, goal, and objectives: Awareness, dissemination, and attainment. *BU R&D Journal*, 21(2), 28-36.

Salom, M. D., & Florendo, Z. T. (2013). Awareness, acceptability, and relevance of the vision, mission, goals, and objectives of the BSEMT program. *E-International Scientific Research Journal*, 5(1), 236–246.

Sebastian, M. & Villa, E. (2022). Stakeholders' acceptance and perceived attainability of Cavite State University–Tanza Campus vision, mission, goals, and objectives towards educational activities and practices. *International Journal of Research in Education Humanities and Commerce*, 3(5), 145-163. <https://ijrehc.com/vol-3-issue-5/stakeholders-acceptance-and-perceived-attainability-of-cavite-state-university-tanza-campus-vision-mission-goals-and-objectives-towards-educational-activities-and-practices/>

Segismundo, M. C. (2017). Stakeholders’ awareness and acceptance of graduate programs’ vision, mission, goals, and objectives, SY 2017-2018. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 5(11), 948-953.

Simbulan, S. & Taja-on, E. (2021). Awareness and acceptance of the philosophy, vision, mission, goals and objectives of the school of education: Stakeholders’ evaluation. *School of Education Research Journal,* 2(1), 29-44.

Talosa, A., Licopit, D. G., Macadangdang, K., Utanes, N., Cabalbag, A. (2021). Stakeholders’ level of awareness and attainability of Cagayan State University vision and mission and graduate school goals and objectives. *International Journal of Arts, Sciences, and Education*, 1(3), 1-14.

Tubang-Delgado, M. & Martinez-Farren, M. L. (2022). Awareness and acceptability of the vision, mission, goals and objectives; and the quality policy of the University of Antique. *International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences*, 9(5), 182-189 <https://www.ijires.org/index.php/issues?view=publication&task=show&id=674>

University of La Salette, Incorporated-High School. (n.d.). ULSHS Administrative Manual

Villanca, A., Binayao, B., & Caterial, M. Z. (2021). Assessing the vision, mission, goals and objectives of a State University in Southern Philippines.  *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 5(10), 189-194.